

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite because the term “gerotor” is not understood. It is respectfully submitted that the term “gerotor” is well recognized in the art. The title for PTO class 418, subclass 61.3 is “Rotor has one less lobe than cylinder (i.e., **Gerotor** type)” (emphasis added.) The PTO search engine shows some 103 US patents having “gerotor” in the title and 1003 patents where the term appears somewhere in the patent. Collectively, these facts show a gerotor type pump to be well recognized. For background purposes only, the functioning of a gerotor is shown at <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gerotor>.

Claims 1, 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Langley et al. Langley is no more than the typical prior art which requires a system to be engineered from a multitude of discrete parts and is not the sort of plug and play system contemplated and claimed. It is not suited for mounting on a drum and there is no suggestion to do so. It also shows separate pump and meter rather than the combined unit described and claimed by Applicants. As to claim 5, while Langley may show a check valve 27, it does not show or describe such operating at a predetermined pressure as described and claimed by Applicants. Similarly, there is no disclosure of the limitation of claim 6 wherein the dispense valve communicates with the flow meter through said dispense hose.


Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Few '357. Few again is no more than the typical prior art which requires a system to be engineered from a multitude of discrete parts and is not the sort of plug and play system contemplated and claimed. It is not suited for mounting on a drum and there is no suggestion to do so. It also does not have the meter

Appl.No. 10/528,524
Amdt.dated June 25, 2007
Reply to Office action of April 2, 2007

and pump as part of a single unit. Few further shows the dispense valve as part of the meter and does not show the dispense valve connected to the meter/pump by a hose as described and claimed by Applicants nor does it show a hose storage device or hose reel as part of the dispenser as set forth in claims 3 and 4.

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Langley in view of Few '364. It is submitted that Langley shows all of the claimed features except the use of wireless communication between the flow meter and the dispensing valve. In addition of the limitations lacking in Langley as set forth above with respect to claim 1, it is submitted that even if Few were combined with Langley (notwithstanding the lack of suggestion to do so), the claimed invention would not result. The remote pendant cited is not wireless but clearly wired as shown in the drawings. Not only is pendant 230 wired but it is also not part of the dispense valve. There is no suggestion as to how or why one skilled in the art might incorporate such into Langley which shows no display or the like on dispense valve 24. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the claims as amended patentably distinguish over the rejection of record. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,



Douglas B. Farrow
Registration No. 28582
Graco Inc.
PO Box 1441
Minneapolis, MN 55440
(612) 623-6769
pto@graco.com